

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 1, 2007 (hereinafter "Office Action"), FIGURE 1 was objected to for omitting a legend such as Prior Art. Claims 60-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 49-57 and 60-78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 74-78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 43-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0176118, to Strittmatter et al. (hereinafter "Strittmatter"). Claims 58-78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strittmatter in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0083228, to Chiloyan et al. (hereinafter "Chiloyan").

In response to the Office Action, applicants have amended Claims 43, 44, 48, 58, 60, and 72-74. Claims 45-47, 61, and 78 have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 43, 44, 48-60, and 62-77 are currently pending in this application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and for the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and request continued examination and allowance of the pending claims. Prior to discussing the reasons why applicants believe that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, a brief description of the disclosed subject matter and the cited references are presented. It should be appreciated, however, that the following descriptions are provided to assist the Examiner in appreciating the differences between the claimed subject matter and cited references, and should not be construed as limitations on the disclosed subject matter.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Brief Descriptions

Disclosed Subject Matter

As recited by the pending claims of the present application, a system for presenting device information in a unified and consistent way and for accessing and manipulating device information for user selected devices is presented. The system maintains a common dialog object displaying device information through a set of actionable icons. (Application, p. 14, lines 2-6.) Device information is retrieved by accessing enumerated device information contained in a function discovery database. (Application, p. 12, lines 20-21.) This information can be filtered based on a user-specified filter, to prevent unwanted devices from being displayed. (Application, p. 14, lines 12-15; p. 15, lines 9-11.) When an actionable icon is selected by a user, a reference for the device is returned by accessing the enumerated device information contained in the function discovery database. (Application, p. 13, lines 4-5.) To facilitate communications between the common dialog object, a programming interface is used when accessing enumerated device information with the function discovery database. (Application, p. 6, lines 25-26.)

Strittmatter (U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0176118)

Strittmatter purportedly discloses a system that includes a search logic for a mobile device. The search logic is configured to perform a discovery process that causes a radio frequency transceiver to discover electronic devices having a compatible radio frequency transceiver. The search logic is configured to execute asynchronously with one or more different processes. A display logic is configured to display a device identifier for each of the electronic devices that are discovered.

Applicants respectfully submit that Strittmatter fails to disclose a user-selected filter as recited in the current application. When a user in the current application selects a filter, only a subset of devices matching the filter is displayed. (Application, p. 15, lines 9-11.) The Office

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Action alleges that Strittmatter discloses similar filtering logic. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion and submit that Strittmatter does not disclose filtering logic that causes only a subset of enumerated devices to be displayed. Strittmatter describes filtering logic that changes the *relevance* of each discovered device, but not filtering logic that causes a *subset* of devices to be displayed based on that filter. *See, e.g.,* Strittmatter, paras. 77, 79 ("For example, if the desired service attributes 925 includes one or more required attributes and an imaging device does not have the capability of a required attribute, the relevance of that imaging device would become very low. . . . As the relevance of each discovered imaging device 905 is determined, a device list 945 can be generated and/or updated showing *each discovered imaging device* and their [*sic*] relevance to the current imaging request 920." (Emphasis added.)) Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Strittmatter fails to teach, describe, or suggest the features of the current application.

Chiloyan (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0083228)

Chiloyan purportedly discloses a method and system for using a peripheral device identifier obtained from a peripheral device to determine a network address from a database, or generate the network address based on the identifier. The method includes automatically transferring at least one identifier from the peripheral device to a host device when the peripheral device is connected to the host device. The identifier is used as an index to automatically determine a network address from a database on the host device or a remote device, or to automatically generate a network address. Then, communication occurs between the host device and a remote device or other source of the information indicated by the network address.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Chiloyan teaches, describes, or suggests the features of the present application, including the use of a user-selected filter.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to FIGURE 1 under M.P.E.P. § 608.02(g) as only illustrating that which is old. As argued in the Amendment After Final mailed on December 3, 2007 (hereinafter "Previous Response"), applicants respectfully disagree with this objection. The Advisory Action mailed on December 26, 2007 (hereinafter "Advisory Action") stated that the applicants' arguments and amendments in the Previous Response were sufficient to overcome this objection. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication, and respectfully submit that withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is merited.

Rejection of Claims 60-73 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action rejected independent Claims 60 and 72, along with their respective dependent claims, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants initially addressed these rejections with amendments and arguments in the Previous Response, and the corresponding Advisory Action stated that the proposed amendments were sufficient to overcome these rejections. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication, and respectfully submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections is merited.

Rejection of Claims 49-57 and 60-78 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (Written Description Requirement)

The Office Action rejected Claims 49-57 and 60-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants initially addressed these rejections with amendments and arguments in the Previous Response. The corresponding Advisory Action stated that, except with respect to Claim 78, the proposed amendments were sufficient to overcome these rejections. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication. Applicants have canceled Claim 78, and respectfully submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections of pending Claims 49-57 and 60-77 is merited.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Rejection of Claims 74-78 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (Indefiniteness)

The Office Action rejected Claim 74, along with its dependent claims, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite on the steps required to arrive with "providing information in a unified and consistent way to a common dialog object." Office Action, pp. 8-9. Applicants initially addressed these rejections with amendments and arguments in the Previous Response, and the Advisory Action stated that the corresponding amendments of the Previous Response were sufficient to overcome these rejections. Applicants thank the Examiner for this indication, and respectfully submit that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections of pending Claims 74-77 is merited.

Rejection of Claims 43, 44, and 48-57 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected Claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Strittmatter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, Claim 43 recites:

43. A method for device selection in a computer system, the method comprising:
- creating a common dialog object suitable for displaying devices to a user on a display device;
 - associating a ***user-selected filter*** with the common dialog object;
 - obtaining device information to be displayed within the common dialog object by accessing device information contained in a function discovery database;
 - filtering the device information using the user-selected filter to obtain a filtered subset of enumerated devices;***
 - displaying the common dialog object with the filtered subset of enumerated devices;
 - receiving a user selection of a device from the displayed common dialog object; and
 - returning a reference to the selected device. (Emphasis added.)

Support for the amendments can be found at least in the Specification on page 14, lines 12-15; and on page 15, lines 9-11. The Office Action recites various portions of

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Strittmatter as teaching the features of Claim 43. Applicants respectfully submit that Strittmatter does not teach or suggest a user-selected filter which is used to obtain a filtered *subset* of enumerated devices as recited in amended Claim 43. Even if, for the sake of argument, Strittmatter does teach adjusting the relevance of enumerated devices based on user input (which applicants expressly deny), applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Strittmatter teaches, describes, or suggests using user input to obtain and subsequently display a *subset* of enumerated devices. Thus, it would not be an obvious modification. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Strittmatter fails to teach, describe, or suggest all of the features of amended Claim 43.

Rejected Claims 44 and 48-57 depend from Claim 43. Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of these dependencies, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. Applicants further submit that the rejection of Claim 43 introduced in the Advisory Action based on failure to find mention of the newly added limitation in the original Specification is moot based on the most recent amendment. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 43, 44, and 48-57 are patentable, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Rejection of Claims 58-77 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 58-59

Rejected Claims 58 and 59 depend from Claim 43. Applicants submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as neither Strittmatter nor Chiloyan teach or suggest all of the features of Claim 43, as discussed above. Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 58 and 59 are patentable, and that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 58 and 59 is merited.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Claims 60-73

The Office Action rejected independent Claims 60 and 72 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Strittmatter in view of Chiloyan. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As amended, Claim 60 recites:

60. A system for accessing and manipulating device information for user selected desired devices, wherein the device information is presented in a unified way, the system comprising:

- a set of installed devices;
- a device selection user interface having actionable icons for the set of devices;
- a function discovery database having enumerated device information corresponding to the set of installed devices;
- a programming interface corresponding to the device selection user interface for interacting with the function discovery database;
- a filtering component for selecting a subset of enumerated devices having a plurality of *user-selectable filters* and an executable component, which, when executed, filters device information using a user-selected filter to obtain a *filtered subset of enumerated devices*; and
- a data processing component having an executable component, which, when executed:
 - creates a common dialog object on the user interface having actionable icons for the set of devices;
 - associates a user-selected filter with the common dialog object;
 - obtains a filtered subset of enumerated devices to be displayed within the common dialog object by accessing device information contained in the function discovery database through the programming interface and the filtering component;
 - displays the common dialog object with the filtered subset of enumerated devices;
 - receives a user selection of a device from the displayed common dialog object; and
 - returns a reference to the selected device. (Emphasis added.)

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682 8100

As amended, Claim 72 recites:

72. A computer-readable medium storing executable computer-readable components for presenting device information in a unified and consistent way and for accessing and manipulating device information for user selected devices, the executable computer-readable components comprising:

a device selection user interface component for displaying actionable icon components for a set of installed devices;

a programming interface component corresponding to the device selection user interface component for interacting with a function discovery database, the function discovery database having enumerated device information corresponding to a set of devices; and

a data processing component having an executable component, which, when executed:

creates a common dialog object on the user interface component having actionable icon components for the set of devices;

associates a *user-selected filter* with the common dialog object;

obtains device information to be displayed within the common dialog object by accessing device information contained in the function discovery database through the programming interface component;

filtering the device information using the user-selected filter to obtain a *filtered subset of enumerated devices*;

displays the common dialog object with the filtered subset of enumerated devices;

receives a user selection of a device from the displayed common dialog object;

returns a reference to the selected device. (Emphasis added.)

As discussed above with respect to Claim 43, applicants respectfully submit that Strittmatter fails to teach or suggest a user-selected filter used to obtain a *filtered subset of enumerated devices* as recited in amended Claims 60 and 72. Further, applicants submit that Chiloyan does not overcome these deficiencies of Strittmatter. Thus, it would not be an obvious modification. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 60 and 72 are patentable.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206 682 8100

Rejected Claims 61-71 depend from Claim 60. Rejected Claim 73 depends from Claim 72. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of these dependencies, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 60-73 are patentable, and that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 60-73 is merited.

Claims 74-77

The Office Action rejected independent Claim 74 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Strittmatter in view of Chiloyan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, Claim 74 recites:

74. A method for providing information in a unified and consistent way to a common dialog object through a programming interface, the method comprising:

receiving a first information from the common dialog object through a first segment of code on the programming interface;

accessing enumerated information concerning installed devices on a function discovery database, the first information being communicated through the first segment of code to a second segment of code on the programming interface;

filtering the enumerated information using a *user-selected filter* to obtain a ***filtered subset of enumerated information***; and

returning the filtered subset of enumerated information concerning installed devices to the common dialog object through the programming interface. (Emphasis added.)

As discussed above with respect to Claim 43, applicants respectfully submit that Strittmatter fails to teach or suggest a user-selected filter used to obtain a *filtered subset of enumerated information* as recited in amended Claim 74. Further, applicants submit that Chiloyan does not overcome these deficiencies of Strittmatter. Thus, it would not be an obvious modification. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 74 is patentable.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Rejected Claims 75-77 depend from Claim 74. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency, as well as by virtue of the other limitations set forth therein. Accordingly, applicants submit that Claims 74-77 are patentable, and that withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 74-77 is merited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance over the cited and applied references, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same. The Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the number provided below to resolve any issues that may arise in order to advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

for Tracy S. Powell
Reg # 22,178
Tracy S. Powell
Registration No. 53,479
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1786

TSP/DPS:lal

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100